UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2510th MEETING: 5 JANUARY 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2510)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa: Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2510th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 5 January 1984, at 3:30 p.m.

President: Mr. Javier CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2510)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244)

The meeting was called to order at 4.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244)

1. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meeting on this item [*2509th meeting*], I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Ethiopia, Mozambique, South Africa, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Seifu (Ethiopia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Amega (Togo), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Nigeria, the Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. Audu (Nigeria), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/16248, which contains the text of a letter dated 3 January from the representative of Jamaica to the Secretary-General.

4. The first speaker is the representative of Ethiopia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia): Only two weeks ago [*2508th meeting*] the Council adopted resolution 545 (1983), in which it demanded that South Africa should unconditionally withdraw all its occupation forces from the territory of Angola and cease all violations against that State and scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

6. In view of the developments thereafter within Angolan territory, however, one gets the impression that the racist régime of South Africa is totally unaware of the adoption of resolution 545 (1983). Indeed, all that South Africa has done during the past two weeks and what the Council demanded that it do are diametrically opposite. By committing thousands of its troops, the régime has since 15 December 1983 intensified its unprovoked acts of aggression and extended its illegal occupation even deeper into Angolan territory. In the process many have lost their lives, including Angolan civilians and Namibian refugees. Helpless women, children and the aged are among the victims. The destruction of property and the damage to other economic infrastructures are quite extensive.

7. Under the circumstances, one cannot help but wonder how the provisions of resolution 545 (1983) escaped the attention of the racists in Pretoria, espe-

cially when their representatives had actually participated in the debate leading to the adoption of that resolution. Of course, one does not have to think hard or look far to get the answer. Time and again Pretoria has told the world in no uncertain terms that it could not care less what the Council does or what the international community at large thinks, so long as its important ally and its other Western friends stand by its side. Indeed, South Africa's intensification of its war of aggression against Angola is but that régime's arrogant response to resolution 545 (1983). By this action Pretoria is not only expressing its disdain for the Council but is also, in a sense, throwing down the gauntlet. How the Council responds to this challenge will no doubt determine its effectiveness in the short term and its long-term relevance in the maintenance of international peace and security.

8. We all know that from its first day of independence Angola has been denied peace and tranquillity by the racists of Pretoria. Why Angola has to be a primary target for South Africa's lawless conduct is, I am sure, clear to all. What is not clear, however, at least to the Ethiopian delegation, is why the Angolan people should bear the brunt of the burden for Namibia's independence, particularly when that Territory is a unique and legal responsibility of the United Nations.

9. Aside from the oppressed people of Namibia, I submit, no other people has suffered more and paid so dearly for the just cause of Namibia's freedom and independence as has the Angolan people. We in Ethiopia are therefore convinced that the time has come for all of us to sacrifice a little more so that colonialism and racism will be wiped out in the southern region of Africa and so that Angola and the other front-line States will at long last enjoy their independence in peace and tranquil stability. In this regard the Council, we believe, has a special responsibility.

10. That Angola, however, has come to the Council twice in less than one month is, I dare say, a sad commentary on the effectiveness of the Council and on the respect its decisions command in certain quarters. Angola's frequent resort to the Council and South Africa's cynical, hypocritical and impudent response, as illustrated by the statement of its representative only yesterday in the Council [*2509th meeting*], are also signs of the times. These are times when the strong recognize no legal or moral constraints on the exercise of their military, economic or political might and influence. These are also times when the small and the weak seem to have been denied the protection of legal norms and moral precepts as well as of the international bodies set up to implement those norms and precepts.

11. When, in the times in which we live, a small weak State such as the sister Republic of Angola is subjected to wanton acts of aggression, not only is that country's inherent right to seek outside assistance in legitimate self-defence questioned by some, but those who come to its assistance in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations are also given uncomplimentary labels and are made targets of diplomatic harassment. And again when, pursuant to the collective security provisions of the Charter, a small and weak country resorts to the Council in search of assistance and redress, as Angola is doing now, the response it gets is more often than not commensurate neither with what it had originally sought nor with what the objective situation at the minimum demands.

12. In these times and under such circumstances I must ask—and indeed, we all must ask—what small nations victims of aggression are expected to do. Should they seek guarantee for their security in the effectiveness of the Council and the authority of international law, as Angola is attempting to do? Alas, our experience in this regard is very discouraging. Or, in the circumstances, should such States pursue their security interests in military alliances with bigger and more powerful nations? This undoubtedly will undermine not only the foundation of the very fragile international legal order but also that of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which we cherish and value highly.

13. So the dilemma persists and the question remains unanswered. It is therefore little wonder that what a small and weak State should do when victimized by the forces of imperialism, short of abandoning its sovereignty and independence, is one of the burning questions of our time. You, Mr. President, coming as you do from a country over which the very real threat of imminent aggression and actual subversion hovers, are, we believe, in a much better position to empathize and sympathize with the plight of the suffering people of Angola. That is why we feel fortunate in having you to preside over these deliberations. While wishing you every success in your endeavours, the Ethiopian delegation would also like to express its satisfaction at the excellent manner in which your predecessor, the representative of the Netherlands, guided the work of the Council last month.

14. Finally, I should like to read the statement issued on 28 December 1983 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Ethiopian Government regarding the invasion of Angola by the forces of racist South Africa. That statement reads:

> "It is with deep shock and indignation that socialist Ethiopia has learned of the latest aggression committed by the racist Pretoria régime against the People's Republic of Angola.
>
> "The *apartheid* régime has consistently carried out economic sabotage and blackmail as well as naked aggression against the front-line States. One of the most frequent targets and unfortunate victims of such blatant invasion has been the People's Republic of Angola. In collusion with the renegade organization of armed bandits—the so-called UNITA [*União Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola*]—

the terrorist régime has repeatedly waged brutal aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

"This campaign against the sister Republic is not only aimed at stifling the revolutionary process and at the destabilization of its progressive party and Government; it is also designed to delay Namibia's independence.

"As history has amply demonstrated time and again, the genuine struggle of the people in defense of their sovereignty, territorial integrity and socio-economic emancipation is inevitably bound to triumph. It is therefore self-evident that the victory of the heroic people of southern Africa over the machinations of imperialism and reaction is imminent.

"While reaffirming its support for the recent United Nations Security Council resolution 545 (1983), socialist Ethiopia once again calls upon the international community to intensify the world-wide campaign to isolate the Pretoria régime and urges all peace-loving peoples and Governments to increase their material and financial support to the front-line countries, in particular to Angola, as well as to the liberation movements of southern Africa.

"In vehemently condemning the latest dastardly act of the terrorist régime against the People's Republic of Angola socialist Ethiopia reiterates its support for the people and Government of that sister country in the heroic struggle to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their motherland."

15. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): Allow me to begin by extending to you, Sir, the sincere congratulations of the Pakistan delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the month of January which gives you the opportunity of launching the Council on its activities for the new year. We wish you and the Council every success in the new year and take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome in our midst to Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Upper Volta, which have been elected members of the Council. At the same time, we shall miss the presence of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire, with which we worked in close co-operation, greatly benefiting from their outstanding contributions to the efforts of the Council to advance the cause of global peace and strengthen the fabric of international security.

16. I have had the privilege and pleasure of working with you in the Security Council, as well as in other United Nations forums, throughout the preceding year, getting an opportunity to become aware of your qualities of statesmanship and diplomatic skill which will now enable you to guide the Council with success and distinction during this month.

17. I should like also to express our profound appreciation of the excellent manner in which Mr. van der Stoel, the representative of the Netherlands, presided over the Council's deliberations during the month of December.

18. Only last month [*2504th to 2508th meetings*] the Council heard Angola's complaint regarding South Africa's continuing aggression against its territory and strongly condemned South Africa for its acts of aggression against Angola and its occupation of parts of Angolan territory. The Council demanded the unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola and the cessation of all violations of Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity, demands that were embodied in resolution 545 (1983).

19. The list of military acts of aggression by the armed forces of South Africa against Angola annexed to the letter dated 31 December 1983, from the President of Angola to the Secretary-General [*S/16245*], clearly shows that South Africa not only continued its military activities against Angola but also intensified its aggressive strikes against Angolan territory in insolent disregard of the Council's deliberations and decisions.

20. Mr. de Figueiredo, the representative of Angola, has informed the Council [*2504th meeting*] of the size and scale of South African military intervention inside Angola and the extent and enormity of its acts of aggression since 1976. He has also described the latest operation undertaken by South Africa against Angolan territory as one of the largest such operations. In an editorial today, *The New York Times* states that South Africa appears to be digging in indefinitely in Angola and is spending $1.5 billion a year to conduct that war.

21. It should be a matter of deep concern to the Council that South African can defy its decisions with impunity and engage in seemingly limitless acts of aggression against a sovereign State. Nothing has emboldened South Africa in continuing and intensifying its attacks against Angola more than its comfortable feeling that the Council will not be able to take strong action to prevent it from doing so. Continued failure to take effective action in this case would further undermine the Council's credibility as an instrument for the maintenance of peace and security, which has already suffered considerable damage by its inability to act firmly in the face of grave crises afflicting several other regions of the world.

22. Last month the Council condemned for the sixth time South Africa's eight-year-old aggression against Angola. It is now time that the Council's verdict be accompanied by a clear warning that, unless South Africa heeds its call, the Council will proceed to mandatory action against it.

23. While we remain preoccupied with South Africa's renewed aggression against Angola and ask the Council to act firmly, we should not fail to take note of the letter of 31 December from the President of Angola to the Secretary-General. That important communication revives hope for the reactivation of the diplomatic pro-

cess to effect the withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory and to achieve a peaceful settlement of the central issue of Namibian independence on the basis of Council resolution 435 (1978).

24. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information of South Africa, in his letter dated 15 December to the Secretary-General [*S/16219, annex I*], made a conditional offer of disengagement of its forces beginning 31 January 1984. It is to the credit of the Government of Angola that it has given a positive and constructive response even to an ambiguous offer, which has been virtually nullified by the subsequent South African attacks against Angolan territory.

25. In his communication to the Secretary-General, the President of Angola stated that the Angolan Government would not oppose the establishment of a truce of 30 days after 31 January 1984, if the Secretary-General obtained the agreement of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and if the South African Government withdrew its military units from Angolan territory and solemnly promised to initiate the implementation, within 15 days after that period, of resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia, without linking it to extraneous considerations.

26. The offer of a truce of 30 days after the date which South Africa itself has set for the disengagement of its forces from Angola should create an opportunity for the Secretary-General to ascertain whether South Africa is genuinely interested in peace in the region and is willing to co-operate with his efforts for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) which approves the United Nations plan for Namibian independence.

27. South Africa remains in illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia and, by a convoluted logic, seeks to use this illegality to justify its aggression against Angola—yet another illegality. It is incumbent on the Council to act strongly to put an end to this intolerable situation.

28. The people of Angola have endured continuing aggression at the hands of South Africa for supporting the liberation of Namibia from foreign and colonial domination and for providing a shield to SWAPO, which is leading the Namibian struggle for independence. We appreciate the courage and resolution of the people and Government of Angola which, in maintaining their support of a just cause, are willing to face the consequences of the hostility of a ruthless and powerful aggressor. They are on the side of justice. They deserve our respect and full support.

29. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. It is my honour to invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

30. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Allow me at the outset to express to you, Sir, our greatest pleasure on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. We sincerely hope that Nicaragua's presidency, which you so ably represent, augurs a new year free from aggression, the threat of aggression, muscle flexing, gun-boat diplomacy, occupation, foreign intervention and oppression in all their forms.

31. I take this opportunity to express our thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. van der Stoel, the representative of the Netherlands, who last month presided over the Council's work with wisdom and has imprinted it with high and noble human values.

32. I take this opportunity also to congratulate the new members of the Council—India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta.

33. Angola's new complaint against South Africa is another step in urging the Council to put an end to an aggression which has spread continuously since 1976 and is now escalating—aggression aimed at undermining Angola's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The intensification of that aggression, both qualitative and quantitative, as well as its systematic character, indicates that its final objective is to deprive the valiant people of Angola of the achievements it has made since the collapse of Portuguese colonialism in 1975.

34. This latest act of aggression, which has extended 200 kilometres inside Angolan territory, with the use of the most modern means of warfare and destruction, must be analysed in the context of the repeated attempts by the racist régime in Pretoria to spread its imperialist hegemony. This is a concerted act, not only against Angola but also against southern Africa as a whole.

35. The latest act of aggression against Angola has been characterized by unprecedented violence and barbarity; yet we must not forget that South Africa's aggression last year involved a number of other African countries—in particular, Lesotho and Mozambique—which are facing a régime which basically does not recognize the African person. How could it possibly recognize independent African peoples?

36. Only a few days ago, at the end of last month [*2508th meeting*], the Council adopted resolution 545 (1983) in which it demanded that South Africa unconditionally withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces and henceforth scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. It is regrettable that the United States abstained in the vote. A few days later South Africa responded with a wide-ranging act of aggression—even more wide-ranging that the previous acts of aggression—as though South Africa wanted to tell this Council: "You have no jurisdiction nor do you have a mandate over my aggressive tendencies. There is someone in your very Council who protects my arrogance and provides me with all my needs. My objective meets my protector's interests."

37. The aim behind the latest escalation of aggression against Angola is to force it into submission so that it may become another satellite, joining other African States in South Africa's orbit. Thus it is an attempt to place the whole region under imperialist hegemony. Furthermore, this escalation comes at a time when acts of aggression are being perpetrated against States in Central America and in the Middle East by South Africa's allies, with Israel at their fore.

38. Was not the "constructive engagement" between international imperialism and South Africa an encouragement to the Pretoria Government to increase its acts of oppression against the black majority? Was it not also a signal as well as permission for Pretoria to dominate southern Africa both militarily and economically? Was not the policy of "constructive engagement" a green light allowing the violation of borders and sovereignty, the killing of innocents and the trampling underfoot of the ardent wishes of Namibia's people for independence? Was it not a defiance of international law, which one supposes that the Council will protect? Has Namibia not become, through this "constructive engagement", a vast military base from which to attack Angola? Who has made South Africa the tenth-largest military Power in the world? Who today chooses to turn a blind eye to Pretoria's nuclear capabilities and even extends co-operation in that regard? Who is providing Pretoria with assistance so that it may spread its dominance and policy of blackmail and perpetrate acts of subversion and terrorism?

39. As everyone knows, the racist régime, thanks to the military power it has gained and to the assured protection it enjoys from some Western States, in particular from the United States, now arrogates to itself the right to sabotage and invade any African State that commits itself to liberation in implementation of United Nations resolutions.

40. It is ironic that the Council, which has been unable to impose comprehensive sanctions against Pretoria because of the well-known right of veto, now stands by helplessly while Pretoria is inflicting all kinds of punishment on some African States.

41. It is truly regrettable that the United States should withhold its aid from States which are in the front line against the *apartheid* system, declaring that their voting pattern in the United Nations was not pleasing to Washington. Is this not like imposing sanctions against the victims of aggression rather than against the aggressor?

42. Pretoria shamelessly seeks to justify its acts of aggression as anti-terrorist actions, whereas it is the very State that perpetrates terrorism, institutionally and constitutionally, and could not exist a single day without practising terrorism.

43. What about "linkage"? That is but an attempt to abort the struggle of the Namibian people and of SWAPO. This pretext of "linkage" is totally unacceptable: it is a transparent attempt to retain colonialism and encourage aggression against Angola.

44. My delegation is participating in this debate to declare once again its whole-hearted brotherly solidarity with the people and Government of Angola against this aggression which aims, among other things, at undermining Angola's independence as well as killing innocent civilians and destroying the social and economic infrastructures of a young State that is mobilizing its forces to overcome a period of backwardness imposed upon it by colonialism. We say to Angola that we are at one with it in our common struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

45. We also believe it necessary to draw attention to the coincidence and harmony between Pretoria's acts, the Zionist régime in Palestine and the tragic situation suffered by the people of Lebanon because of Israel's invasion and occupation and the barbaric acts being perpetrated against civilians inside and outside occupied Lebanese territory. Through our own sufferings and our bitter experience, we can fully understand what Angola and the peoples and States of southern Africa are suffering. We cannot but find similarities and concordances in the terrorist practices of the two régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv. Both have acquired land by force; both have deported the original inhabitants, the real owners of the land; both have exploited the human and natural resources to line their own pockets; both have classified themselves as superior to other human communities and have gone as far as to create castes to separate them. In Africa, the racist minority claims that it has been chosen to carry the message of the white man; in occupied Palestine, racist Zionism at times claims that it practises occupation, killing, deportation, usurpation and destruction in the name of an invented divine message and at other times in the name of a fabricated history invented and drafted by Zionism to justify its aggression against our Arab people.

46. The Syrian Arab Republic, on the basis of its principled stand, believes in the unity of the Arab-African struggle against racism, *apartheid* and Zionism, all of which have the same aims and are in collusion, co-operating with an evil Power which has an inherent interest in maintaining exploitation, dependence and slavery.

47. There is general agreement that it is impossible to bring the racist terrorist leaders in Pretoria to order except by imposing comprehensive and binding sanctions, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. However, we know that the United States and perhaps others will abort, through the use of the veto, any constructive action by the Council to fulfil its basic responsibility of eradicating aggression through binding collective action. We hope that the Council will not produce a resolution similar to the one it adopted three weeks ago [*resolution 545 (1983)*], which Pretoria would interpret as representing the Council's inability to undertake its tasks in accordance

with the Charter *vis-à-vis* situations that now threaten not merely the peace and security of southern Africa, but of the whole world.

48. Come what may, however, we are convinced that the valiant people of Angola and its Government, with the support of peace-loving nations and people, can, through the use of all the means at its disposal, defend itself and eradicate the aggression imposed upon it. Repeated acts of aggression are but an incentive to the peoples of Africa to rise and defend themselves against this mindless aggression. We are convinced that victory will be our ally as long as our cause is the right one.

49. Mr. LING Qing (China) [*interpretation from Chinese*]: Sir, at the outset, please allow me warmly to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I am convinced that with your competent guidance the Council will successfully discharge its duties in the month of January.

50. By the same token, I should like to thank your predecessor, Mr. Max van der Stoel, the President for the month of December last year, for his outstanding performance.

51. I also wish to take this opportunity to extend, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, our warm welcome to the delegations of Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta to participate in the work of the Council, and sincerely wish that they will contribute substantially to the work of the Council. Meanwhile, we thank the delegations of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire for the tireless efforts they made in the past two years for the fulfilment of the important tasks entrusted to the members of the Council by the international community.

52. The Council adopted resolution 545 (1983) on 20 December last year, in which it demanded that the South African authorities unconditionally withdraw forthwith all their occupation forces from Angola. Hardly had the ink of the resolution dried however, when the South African authorities began to dispatch more troops into Angola for an even larger-scale invasion of that country, penetrating Angolan territory as deep as over 200 kilometres. Furthermore, the South African troops have been bombing and shelling Angolan cities and towns almost daily, inflicting heavy loss of life and property upon the innocent Angolan people.

53. Such unbridled and criminal acts on the part of the South African authorities in continued violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and in disregard of the solemn resolutions of the Security Council have naturally met with strong condemnation by the international community.

54. In order to exonerate themselves from guilt, the South African authorities have repeatedly resorted to totally untenable sophism.

55. One of the pretexts put forward by the South African authorities is that their acts of aggression against Angola are aimed at protecting the Namibian people from attacks by SWAPO. This is a complete reversal of right and wrong and a sheer confusion of black and white. The prolonged occupation of Namibia by South Africa is in itself an illegal action. SWAPO is the sole legal organization representing the Namibian people, and it is recognized by the United Nations. It is now leading the Namibian people in a struggle against the South African occupation of Namibia and for national liberation. If the South African authorities' brutal slaughtering of the Namibian people is not to be regarded as terrorist activity, should we on the contrary describe the latter's struggle against South African colonial rule as terrorism? Is this not the colonialist logic of might is right? This is something that the international community will never accept.

56. Another pretext used by the South African authorities is that Angola sympathizes with and supports the struggle of the Namibian people for national independence. The struggle of the Namibian people against South African racist rule is a just one. It has won resolute support not only from Angola, but also from all other justice-upholding countries and peoples in Africa and throughout the world.

57. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions on this matter. By pursuing policies of aggression and expansion, the South African authorities have grossly trampled underfoot the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. All justice-upholding countries and peoples are determined to wage unswerving struggles against the perverse acts of the South African authorities.

58. The Chinese delegation resolutely supports Angola in its struggle against South African aggression, strongly condemns South Africa for its new large-scale invasion of Angola and demands that South Africa withdraw all its troops from Angola immediately and unconditionally. We hold that, should the South African authorities continue to act obdurately and refuse to implement Council resolutions, the Council should consider taking more effective measures according to Chapter VII of the Charter.

59. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: In our first statement this year, the Soviet delegation would like to stress that as we enter this new year the Soviet Union and Soviet people express serious concern at the sharp deterioration in the international situation and the growing threat of nuclear war caused by senseless militaristic policies. These policies are revealed primarily by the attempts at all costs to upset the military balance that has evolved by deploying in Western Europe new first-strike nuclear weapons and to force peoples and States in Latin America, the Middle East and Africa to submit to foreign diktat. In these complicated inter-

national circumstances the Soviet Union reaffirms its constant policy to maintain and reinforce peace, to rebuff aggression, to curb the arms race and to expand and deepen co-operation among States.

60. The lofty principles of the peace-loving foreign policy of our country were reaffirmed in the decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the international situation and the foreign policy of the Soviet State adopted on 29 December of last year.

61. In accordance with a good tradition, we should like heartily to welcome to the Council the new non-permanent members, the representatives of Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta. We hope their participation in the work of the Council will help to promote the solution of complicated international problems and that it will be constructive and in keeping with the major tasks that confront the Council. For our part, we are prepared to engage in close business-like co-operation with representatives of Member States in order to ensure that the Council can successfully discharge its primary duty under the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security.

62. The election to the Council of four non-aligned countries clearly attests to the role of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in our present world and is recognition of its efforts to improve the international climate, to halt the arms race and to bring about a complete elimination of colonialism. Therefore, it is absolutely natural that India—which now occupies the chairmanship of the Movement and is exerting a positive influence on developments in international affairs at the present time—has become a Council member.

63. The Soviet delegation would also like to pay due tribute to the contributions of those countries whose terms of office in the Council expired last year. The representatives of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire contributed to the work of the Council in 1982 and 1983. Those years were some of the most tense in the Council's work for the past decade and reflected the exacerbation of the overall situation in the world. We wish the representatives of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire every success in their future work.

64. I wish, furthermore, to express gratitude to the representative of the Netherlands, Mr. van der Stoel, for effectively guiding the work of the Council in December last year, although he has not always able to ensure that the Council began its work on time.

65. We are happy to welcome as President of the Council for this month the representative of Nicaragua, Mr. Chamorro Mora, whose people is defending its independence and freedom with such valour. We are sure that he will guide the work of the Council with his well-known ability.

66. Barely two weeks ago the Council adopted a resolution in which it decisively condemned South Africa for the continued aggression against Angola and the occupation of part of the territory of that country. The Council called upon South Africa immediately and unconditionally to withdraw all its occupation forces from the territory of Angola, to cease all violations against that State, and in future strictly to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola. The Council stated that the continued illegal military occupation of the territory of Angola was a flagrant violation of Angola's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and that it posed a threat to international peace [*resolution 545 (1983)*].

67. What was Pretoria's reaction to that clear decision by the Council? Instead of immediately heeding the demands of the Council in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations, the South African aggressor cynically defied the Council, the countries of Africa and all peace-loving mankind. Not only did Pretoria not withdraw its troops from Angola or halt its aggression against that State but, quite the contrary, it used these last two weeks to mount another offensive deep into Angolan territory, to bomb populated areas in that country, killing innocent civilians and perpetrating further acts of State terrorism.

68. The criminal aggression of South African racists against the sovereign independent State of Angola is a flagrant violation of the Charter and tramples underfoot elementary norms of international law. The escalation of aggressive actions by the Pretoria régime against Angola has created a serious threat to peace and security not only in southern Africa but far beyond its borders. The aggressor acts in a manner clearly expecting impunity. Its goal is the same one: to eliminate the progressive régime in Angola.

69. Behind these actions lurk more far-reaching designs on the part of the South African leaders, aimed at perpetuating racist colonial systems in southern Africa through the systematic employment of military might, destabilization of the situation in neighbouring African States, and destruction of the chances for a political settlement in Namibia.

70. The South African racists undertook this recent act of banditry only because they know full well that they can count on the patronage of certain Western Powers—foremost among them the United States, which collaborates with the Pretoria régime and gives it support and political protection.

71. Members of the Council will remember very well that two weeks ago the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom spared no effort to get the African countries to tone down as much as possible the original draft resolution before the Council [*S/16226*]. At that time, Council members heard statements to the effect that the most important thing was not to miss the chance to negotiate with South

Africa and to take advantage of South Africa's proposal in respect of a so-called disengagement [*see S/16219, annex I*]—although even at that time it was perfectly clear to everyone that the South African "proposal" was nothing more than a ploy.

72. Behind the smoke-screen created by that "proposal" and by the claims of Western countries about the need to take advantage of it, South Africa mounted a massive, large-scale offensive deep into Angolan territory.

73. At yesterday's meeting, the representative of Angola, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Upper Volta and many other speakers asked some legitimate questions: How long will this flagrant international lawlessness go on? For how long will the racist aggressor abuse the patience of African States and of the entire international community?

74. Pretoria should understand that its entire policy of piracy against African States is doomed to failure and that it places a heavy lien on the future of South Africa itself and on its relations with the world around it. History and the peoples of Africa will not forgive the crimes being committed by the *apartheid* régime.

75. The African countries and the overwhelming majority of other countries throughout the world are very right in asking another, equally legitimate, question: For how long will the Council be prevented from adopting effective enforcement measures against the South African aggressor? Certain people had the illusion that it was the concern of the West to normalize the situation in southern Africa in the interest of the African countries. But now, after so many years of the Western Powers' obvious pandering to Pretoria, that illusion should be fully dissipated.

76. Whatever the sinister plans of the South African racists and their protectors, Angola, the other front-line African countries, and the national liberation movements of southern Africa will not be broken. They have many friends throughout the whole world. The staunchness of their resistance against aggression and their valour in defence of their freedom and independence have won general respect and are attracting growing support.

77. The Soviet Union firmly sides with Angola and with other African peoples fighting for freedom and independence. Our country strongly condemns South Africa's continuing and escalating aggression against Angola.

78. As is stressed in a TASS statement issued today in Moscow:

> "South Africa's latest act of aggression against Angola once again graphically demonstrates that, through the action of the racist leaders of South Africa and their backers, a situation endangering the cause of peace has developed in southern Africa, and that urgent and concerted international efforts are needed to eliminate it. In the present circumstances, the proposals put forward by the Government of Angola in a message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations are timely and well justified. They are: to put an end to the military operations in Angola, to remove the South African invaders from that area and at long last to set about the practical implementation of a political settlement in Namibia in accordance with United Nations decisions on Namibia, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).
>
> "The Soviet Union believes that States which cherish peace and the security of peoples and all people of good will should raise their voices in the defence of Angola and should, by their resolute actions, frustrate the plans of the racist aggressors and their backers. Aggression must not go unpunished." [*See S/16254, annex*].

79. We are convinced that the Council is duty-bound not merely to adopt another resolution containing another condemnation of the South African aggressors, but to adopt decisive, effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter in order to force South Africa immediately and unconditionally to halt all acts of aggression against Angola and forthwith to withdraw its troops from the occupied territory of Angola. The Council should seek reparations for the Government of Angola for all the damage it has sustained.

80. The Charter requires all Member States to abide by Council decisions and to implement them. The Council should take due account of the refusal of certain countries—South Africa in this case—to implement its decisions and should adopt appropriate measures against the violator. As was stated in the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization for 1982,

> "the best resolution in the world will have little practical effect unless Governments of Member States follow it up with the appropriate support and action."[1]

That comment is quite correct. It applies in this case to Council members which, notwithstanding the Council's condemnation of South Africa for its constant failure to carry out Council decisions, refuse to support the adoption of effective measures which would force Pretoria to abide by the requirements of the Charter. Is it not ironic to hear representatives of those countries complaining about the ineffectiveness of the United Nations when they themselves undermine the authority of the Council?

81. It is high time we saw to it that decisions adopted by the Council were enforced. This is necessary in order to strengthen the authority and influence of the Security Council and of the United Nations in general.

It is necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

82. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I do so with the happiest memories of the beauty of your country and the friendliness of its people.

83. I should like to affirm the debt of gratitude we owe your predecessor, Mr. van der Stoel, representative of the Netherlands, for the sterling service he rendered the Council as its President for December 1983.

84. I also wish warmly to welcome the representatives of the newly elected members of the Council —Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta—seated around this table, and to assure them, as I assure you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council, of the readiness of my delegation to co-operate fully with them in the exercise of our heavy shared responsibilities.

85. Finally, I would thank the retiring members for their dedicated service throughout their term of duty.

86. What a regrettable start to the year 1984. After what was recognized as a restrained debate, the Council ended 1983 by sending a calm, studiedly clear and measured message to South Africa, in the sense that the policies of its Government were the object of the Council's concern and indeed of its unanimous disapproval. With calculated aloofness, the South African authorities once more decided to ignore that signal and instead to escalate their armed intervention in Angola.

87. As a result, more lives have been lost and more property destroyed, as the representative of Angola eloquently explained in detail yesterday. What is perhaps almost as regrettable, this chamber was subjected yesterday to an intervention reminiscent of the attitude of that Shakespearean character who would say, "I am Sir Oracle, and when I open my lips let no dog bark."

88. We had thought that this particular character, as well as his attitudes, had long been buried and best forgotten centuries ago, because surely it could not now be more evident that what is required is not for lips to be opened in expressions of injured innocence but rather for eyes to be opened to the dangerous fires of resentment that are being fueled by South Africa's attitude, and for ears finally to become receptive to the cries of anguish of the Namibian people seeking independence and those of the black peoples in South Africa striving peacefully for full emancipation in their own country.

89. Without repeating our previously stated positions on these aspects, we shall on this occasion limit ourselves to joining ranks in condemning the current armed intervention by South Africa and in expressing solidarity with and support for the helpless Angolan victims.

90. We greatly regret the loss of innocent lives. But we should like to go beyond that. As this new year starts, and despite its inauspicious beginning, there must nevertheless be some room for encouragement in that, in the space of two weeks, two new initiatives have been publicly announced by the protagonists on the spot, the most recent and the more generous by the President of Angola.

91. It is worthy of note that Angola, acting in defence of its sovereignty, and upholding the sacred right of self-determination of peoples, is even more positive in its attitude than South Africa, which illegally occupies Namibia and illegally maintains troops in Angola.

92. We venture to hope that the Council may in the near future devise more appropriate means than have been utilized in the past to discern the positive elements, to build on them, to negotiate stumbling-blocks and to encourage further dialogue and progress, relying as always on the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his able assistants in the pursuit of the cherished objectives of the United Nations for southern Africa.

93. Peace is the common objective of all members, but it requires understanding and restraint as well as co-operative and dedicated efforts by all if it is ever to be attained. The people of Namibia, the nations of southern Africa and the whole world await a change in the negative attitude so far maintained by the Government of South Africa.

94. Perhaps the draft resolution that will be adopted today, as well as the intelligently perceptive editorial entitled "Rewards for Coddling South Africa" that appeared in *The New York Times* today, might finally nudge South Africa into the necessary frame of mind.

95. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) [*interpretation from French*]: Permit me first of all to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the first month of the new year, 1984, and to wish you every success in the fulfilment of your noble task, which will certainly auger well for the cause of peace and security in the world this year.

97. I also wish to express my gratitude to the representative of the Netherlands for his effective guidance of the work of the Council last month.

98. I would take this opportunity to congratulate the five new non-permanent members and to thank all the members of the Council for giving me this chance to take part in the debate.

99. As is stated in the communication of 31 December 1983 from the President of the People's Republic of

Angola to the Secretary-General [*S/16245*] and the urgent message of 1 January 1984 addressed to the President of the Council [*S/16244*], the military situation in southern Angola has worsened dangerously because of the escalating military aggression by South African armed forces since 16 December 1983 deep into Angolan territory, more than 200 kilometres from the Namibian border. The fact that nearly two weeks after the adoption by the Council of resolution 545 (1983) the Council has once again been requested to meet urgently to consider a new Angolan complaint against South African aggression bears clear witness to the seriousness of the situation in Angola, which entails disastrous consequences for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a member State of the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and a Member of the United Nations as well as for peace and security in southern Africa and throughout the world.

100. By yet another insolent act of defiance towards the Council's most recent resolution in which the Council demanded the cessation of acts of aggression and the immediate withdrawal of the South African occupation forces from the territory of Angola, the Pretoria racist régime is determined to further the realization of its plans to destabilize and undermine Angola by intensifying its war of aggression against that country and by committing new offenses there, creating further mourning and destruction. In so doing Pretoria is, on the one hand, trying to consolidate its illegal colonialist domination over Namibia and, on the other, to achieve hegemony over Angola, in the form of the neo-colonialist reconquest agreed upon by international imperialism, as well as over other independent countries in southern Africa. And by so doing Pretoria is continuing to perpetrate a two-fold crime against humanity and against peace, a notorious international crime that can no longer be allowed to remain unpunished.

101. Unfortunately, the reasons for such impunity are basically to be found in the support and encouragement proffered by international imperialism and, first and foremost, by a powerful permanent member of the Council which is using Pretoria in southern Africa as it uses Tel Aviv in the Middle East and other reactionary forces in Central America, in Asia and in the Far East to fight against peoples struggling for national independence and social justice, and which at this very moment is pushing the nuclear arms race into a new hysterical spiral, creating explosive tensions throughout the world, including Europe, and even in space.

102. The urgent need to put an end to the acts of aggression committed by the racist South African régime in Angola is commensurate with the vehemence of the brazen obstinacy with which Pretoria has carried out its recent systematic acts of military aggression, which began on 16 December 1983, deep into Angolan territory while having only the day before, on 15 December, put forward its impudent offer of a "disengagement of forces" [*see S/16219, annex I*]. It is interesting to note that faced with the tide of international condemnation directed against it the South African régime, on the advice of certain of its Western allies, has been forced to resort to a smoke-screen to conceal the escalation of its military aggression while exerting strong pressure in the hope of achieving a success that has so far eluded it through force of arms, namely, the renunciation by the Namibian people of their national liberation struggle and the renunciation by the people of Angola of their right to self-defence against aggression as well as of their internationalist obligation with regard to Namibian independence. However, the threat insolently levelled in the Council yesterday by the representative of Pretoria testifies to the utter impudence of a criminal régime that has been outlawed by the international community and above all to its impotent rage at finding itself unable to force the Namibian and Angolan peoples to lay down their arms.

103. Faced with the current escalation of aggression by South Africa, which poses a serious threat to the independence of Angola and to peace in southern Africa, what are we to do?

104. Notwithstanding seven resolutions adopted by the Security Council since 1976, the aggressor persists with its infamies and its arrogance. It is high time for the international community to turn to more energetic actions to put an end to so intolerable a state of affairs. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has already expressed its firm support to the victim by declaring that aggression against Angola is aggression against the Movement as a whole. It is therefore up to us to strengthen multilateral assistance to the people of Namibia in their struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, as well as to the people and Government of Angola, so that they may more effectively intensify their resistance to South African aggression. For their part, the people and Government of Viet Nam wish to reaffirm their militant solidarity with and total support for this just struggle, which will certainly be victorious.

105. The people of Angola are with great courage and sacrifice facing aggression and are succeeding in forcing the South African troops to retreat after their advance deep into Angolan territory. At the same time, the Government of Angola has demonstrated its good will by informing the Secretary-General that it would have no objections to the establishment of a 30-day truce, on certain precise conditions [*see S/16245*].

106. Nevertheless, it is now abundantly clear that we should cherish no illusions in the light of Pretoria's well-known arrogance and impudence. It is more realistic for the international community to assist in strengthening the SWAPO resistance forces and Angola's defence capability. It is also incumbent upon the Council to condemn South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola more strongly and to demand with greater firmness the immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Angola of the South African occupation troops. At the same time, we must envisage the need to resort to more effective measures.

107. That is why, while subscribing to the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council [*S/16247*], my delegation would like to emphasize the importance of operative paragraph 8, which provides for a future meeting of the Council in the event of non-compliance by South Africa for the purpose of considering "the adoption of more effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations".

108. For, in the final analysis, we must reply to the series of burning questions that were put to us yesterday by the representative of Angola. And we must support his militant slogan: "The struggle continues; victory is certain!"

109. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of Zambia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

110. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the current debate.

111. I should like also to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President for this month. In the same vein, allow me to pay a tribute to the representative of the Netherlands, who efficiently presided over the Council's work last month.

112. This is one of those many occasions when the Council has been called into session at the request of Angola since that country attained independence in 1975. In fact, barely three weeks have passed since the Council met last year to discuss racist South Africa's illegal occupation of southern Angola. Just as we ended 1983 discussing South Africa's illegal occupation of Angola, sadly we begin 1984 by discussing South Africa's continued occupation of and further aggression against Angola. This is a most revolting experience for Angola.

113. As in the past, yesterday Mr. Elisio de Figueiredo of Angola vividly presented his country's case against racist South Africa. It is a case which is well known to all of us. Once again Angola is seeking refuge in the Council because of its belief in the primacy of the Council in terms of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security if only, I might add, it can act decisively to correct the situation. My country, Zambia, shares that belief. At the same time, however, we cannot but express deep regret and consternation at the persistence of racist South Africa's war of unprovoked aggression against Angola, despite the existence of the Council, whose primary duty is to redress such a situation.

114. Zambia is very much concerned at the Pretoria régime's renewed escalation of unprovoked bombing and persistent acts of aggression against Angola, including continued military occupation and violation of the airspace, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. These despicable acts are not only in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and all conceivable norms of international law; they are also in contravention of all the relevant Council decisions, the latest of which is resolution 545 (1983) in which the Council, *inter alia*, demands the unconditional withdrawal of all the South African occupation forces from Angola.

115. It is therefore with a sense of shock that we have learned that, instead of withdrawing unconditionally from Angola in accordance with Council resolution 545 (1983), racist South Africa has chosen to escalate its bombing missions and brought more troops into Angola. This development has progressively worsened the military situation in southern Angola to the extent that the racist South African invading forces have gone more than 200 kilometres inside Angola. It is against that background that Angola would be justified in invoking Article 51 of the Charter precisely to defend itself; we urge the Council to support Angola's sovereign right in this regard. Furthermore, we still maintain that Angola should be compensated by South Africa for the loss of life and destruction of property just as some members around this table have asked for compensation in situations of their interest. The Council should not be seen to apply double standards in the discharge of its responsibility.

116. The Council should strongly condemn racist South Africa for its continued war against the peace-loving people of Angola. This war is a flagrant violation of international law, the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. My delegation views with indignation the fact that the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of other States, which has served as one of the guiding principles of stable inter-State relations, has been completely thrown overboard by racist South Africa. As a consequence, racist South Africa marches at will into the territories of its neighbours, such as Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho.

117. The dastardly acts of aggression and occupation of Angola by racist South Africa are now being made into permanent features. These acts are already threatening peace and security in the region in particular and in the world in general.

118. In this regard, I should like to inform the Council that my country, Zambia, has already experienced some of the untold consequences of racist South Africa's war against Angola. Two thousand Angolan refugees have fled from Angola to Zambia over the past fortnight or so owing to the fighting in southern Angola perpetrated by the racist troops against the people of Angola. I need not over-emphasize the economic consequences attendant upon such an exodus of people fleeing from racist South African terror in their own country to freedom in neighbouring countries; but, thanks to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, a major airlift of Angolan refugees has

started to take them to Luanda from one of the cities of Zambia. In this connection, we wish sincerely to commend the efforts of the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for alleviating the situation.

119. When I addressed the Council on 20 December 1983 on the occupation of southern Angola by South African forces, I drew the Council's attention, *inter alia*, to paragraph 7 of its resolution 475 (1980) on the decision made [*2507th meeting, para. 9*]. For the benefit of those who may have forgotten I shall again, with the Council's permission, quote that paragraph in which the Council decided

> "to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola by the South African racist régime, in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof."

120. The situation under consideration has really got worse. The Council is therefore faced with a challenge to move beyond the ritual of indignant condemnation of the racist Pretoria régime for its aggression and occupation of Angola to taking effective measures which should bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of racist South African forces from southern Angola. Such measures should involve the application of Chapter VII of the Charter.

121. We can no longer condone having a Council that has been turned into a talking forum only. There is no justification whatsoever for retreating from taking such appropriate measures in the light of racist South Africa's persistence, with impunity, in defying the Council over the years.

122. It is the belief of my delegation that the racist Pretoria régime has always indulged in belligerent and intransigent behaviour because of the lavish support and comfort it enjoys from some Western Powers, including a few represented around this table. The refusal, for instance, of some members of the Council in the past to support necessary strong measures provided in the Charter has undoubtedly emboldened racist South Africa to persist in its commitment of international crimes which, aside from those committed against Angola, include the illegal occupation of Namibia, the practice of the *apartheid* system and the general destabilization of the independent African States in the region.

123. I wish to leave a thought which I consider important with the Council. As the Council is aware, the basis of the South African régime's behaviour both inside and outside South Africa is *apartheid*. All members around this table have condemned *apartheid* either as a crime against human conscience or as a crime against humanity. But why is it that in spite of this consensus of the international community against *apartheid* the Pretoria régime continues to gain more strength every day? It is because a small number of members around this table, even if they denounce *apartheid*, support the Pretoria régime politically, economically, diplomatically and militarily.

124. The question I should like to pose at this point is: Would we be wrong in suggesting that by the very fact of these few members of the Council sustaining the South African régime they are, *ipso facto*, sustaining the *apartheid* system?

125. It might be useful for some members of the Council to reflect on this question and find out the extent to which this state of affairs has contributed to the failure of the Council so far in taking effective measures against the Pretoria régime.

126. Finally I take this opportunity to restate my country's support for and solidarity with the Government and people of Angola in their struggle against the racist occupation which the Council must end so that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola can be restored and respected.

127. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) [*interpretation from Russian*]: Mr. President, the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is extremely pleased to be commencing its work in the Council under your leadership. You represent a country the valour and resolve of whose people in upholding their independence and own path of development have won for it sincere sympathy throughout the world, far-reaching in understanding and support. The Ukrainian SSR hopes that the people of Nicaragua will fully resolve the difficult tasks confronting it. Allow me sincerely to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of January and to wish you every success in this difficult but highly esteemed and important work.

128. We should like to congratulate also the representative of the Netherlands, who ably guided the work of the Council in December.

129. We join in the congratulations addressed to the delegations of Egypt, India, Peru and the Upper Volta on their election to the Council. We wish them fruitful work and pledge our co-operation.

130. The representatives of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire, whose terms of office in the Council expired only a few days ago, deserve our recognition and thanks.

131. Our delegation is extremely grateful to you, Sir, and to all delegations that welcomed the Ukraine after our election to the Council. In this post the Ukrainian SSR replaced Poland, a fraternal socialist country to which we are closely bound by our common commitment to the cause of peace and international security. I should like to transmit our gratitude to Mr. Wlod-

zimierz Natorf for the contribution made by Poland to the Council's work over the last two years and during its previous years of membership in the Council.

132. For the Ukrainian SSR to participate in the work of the Council is a great honour. I should like to assure members that we view our participation in the work of the Council with a great sense of seriousness and responsibility and will try to discharge our duties in the best possible manner.

133. The most recent, and sixth, Council resolution on the continuing acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola was adopted on 20 December last year [*resolution 545 (1983)*]. After due consideration of South Africa's arbitrary behaviour, the Council unanimously, with one abstention, demanded that South Africa should unconditionally withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces from the territory of Angola, cease all violations against that State and henceforth scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

134. Today, however, the Council is being compelled to take cognizance of a major escalation of military intervention in Angola which has penetrated 200 kilometres into Angolan territory. The aggressor has used sophisticated materiel—jet aircraft, powerful artillery, armoured vehicles and helicopters.

135. As a result of the many years of the war waged by South Africa against Angola since 1975, many thousands of totally innocent people—children, women and old people—have perished. Hundreds of villages and towns have been destroyed. Extensive material damage has been caused totalling tens of billions of dollars. The magnitude of South Africa's aggression against Angola and other African States is increasing.

136. That in essence is the entire response of the racist rulers of South Africa to the many decisions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and other United Nations bodies.

137. The plan of the Pretoria régime, like the plans of those who pander to and protect the racists, is to hang onto their domination in Namibia and in southern Africa by any means at any price. It seems that after this bid for "linkage" has turned out to be a failure for the racists, they are now hastening to attain their goals by military means and do not flinch from large-scale warfare against Angola.

138. They are seeking to intimidate Angola, to force it to depart from a peace-loving, independent policy in international affairs and subjugate it to imperialist diktat and to frustrate progressive socio-economic reforms in other African countries in order to safeguard the *apartheid* régime and maintain colonial systems in southern Africa.

139. The recent escalation of aggression by South Africa against Angola, with the connivance and support of its protectors, primarily the United States, is a very serious danger for the cause of peace and security not only in southern Africa but throughout the world.

140. One would need to have incredible impudence and cynicism to state that these operations in southern Angola were a prerequisite for South Africa to guarantee its security, but that was precisely what was stated in the Council in December and repeated yesterday by the representative of South Africa. This reminds one very much of the policy of so-called constructive engagement pursued by the senior partner of the racists.

141. As has been stated by many delegations in the Council, it is that very co-operation which is the main obstacle to the elimination of colonialism and racism in southern Africa and the achievement of a just and effective settlement of the security problems of the African States that cherish peace and justice.

142. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR shares the view that the Council, in view of the many years of gross disregard of its decisions by South Africa, should finally take all necessary measures and institute against the aggressive racist régime sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

143. The Ukrainian SSR decisively condemns South Africa's aggression against Angola and calls for its immediate cessation and the unconditional withdrawal of all occupying forces from Angolan territory. We fully sympathize with the valiant people of Angola, who are defending their freedom and independence by force of arms. In this just and heroic struggle, Angola deservedly enjoys the warm sympathy and support of all honest people in the world and all forces of peace and progress.

144. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

145. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) [*interpretation from French*]: Sir, permit me first of all to convey my warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I am extremely pleased to do so since you represent a friendly country which has shown the world that it is fervently committed to the ideal of freedom, peace and progress. Your well-known conviction, authority and experience will guarantee the success of these meetings.

146. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. van der Stoel of the Netherlands, for the noteworthy qualities he demonstrated while guiding the Council's work last month.

147. Finally, I wish warmly to welcome the new non-permanent members of the Council. I am certain that

their individual and collective contributions will strengthen this body's authority.

148. The current Council debate, the very first in a year that we hope will be favourable for international peace and security, remind us that in southern Africa a policy of aggression and subversion pursued by South Africa is keeping the whole region in a dangerous situation of instability and insecurity.

149. That situation, characterized in particular by large-scale acts of aggression perpetrated by the Pretoria régime against Angola and the military occupation of part of that country's territory by South African troops, is certainly among those that demonstrate unacceptable contempt for the law and seriously threaten international peace and security.

150. This expansionist policy clouds all horizons in southern Africa. The colonial policy in Namibia, the system of *apartheid* imposed upon the South African people, the policy of aggression and subversion against the States of the region all stem from the very nature of a régime that openly declares itself to be racist and that thrives on the general instability it maintains. It is clear today that the repeated attacks against the sovereign States of the region are meant not so much to break the natural solidarity linking them to the Namibian people, but more particularly to impose the racist order on southern Africa through subjugation of the peoples of the region and through a neo-colonial solution in Namibia.

151. Since its accession to independence, Angola has known hardly one day of peace owing to the attacks by the *apartheid* régime. As the Council itself has recognized, the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola are being literally violated. According to information published by the Angolan Government, more than 2,000 acts of aggression, ranging from violations of airspace to invasion and military occupation pure and simple, have been perpetrated by South Africa against Angola since 1975. These acts of aggression have caused thousands of casualties and tens of thousands of refugees to flee the racist terror; the value of the material destruction is estimated at several billion dollars. Savage military attacks, the occupation by force since 1981 of part of Angolan territory, the massive bombing of Angolan provinces—those are the results of this undeclared war that South Africa has unleashed against Angola—a war which, according to Pretoria's spokesman, is meant to put an end to SWAPO's activities.

152. All expansionist régimes are decidedly similar in the incongruity and cynicism of their methods and arguments. Hitler and Mussolini were the masters. To justify its attack on the innocent lamb, the fox in the fable said: "If not you, then your brother". Indeed, the *apartheid* system harbours war, just like all Fascist régimes that have gone before it. It cannot escape this. Injustice and oppression are the very foundations of that system and its precariousness consequently nourishes its expansionist and militaristic ambitions.

153. Perhaps we should remind the Western representatives in the Council that the panegyric of war intoned by the representative of Pretoria reminds us Africans of the statement by a Prussian militarist of a recent era, Helmut von Molke, who wrote: "Perpetual peace is a dream and not even a good one. War is an element in the divine order of the universe. Without war, the world would wallow in materialism." Those words inspired Hitler and Mussolini, as today they inspire the leaders of Pretoria.

154. Not having taken those words seriously, Europe found itself in atrocious wars. We wish to spare southern Africa from a similar tragic fate. That indeed is what led Angola and the front-line States to call for this urgent meeting of the Council. This year marks the hundredth anniversary of the Berlin conference, at which Africa was carved up by an expansionist Europe. It will be 100 years in August 1984 since South West Africa was occupied by Prussian troops. How, in 1984, 100 years later, can we complacently allow a racist régime to impose the same process of colonialization and subjugation in southern Africa? How can a régime whose presence in Namibia has been universally declared illegal and internationally condemned—a régime which denies the right of existence to millions of human beings—come today before this body and declare: "South African security operations in southern Angola have but a single objective, and that is the protection of the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia from terrorist attacks by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)" [*2509th meeting, para. 35*]. How can a régime thrice guilty of crimes against humanity, of a policy of oppression, aggression and illegal occupation come here and declare itself "protector" of a people to which it has denied the most fundamental rights for several decades? Such ludicrous arguments, nevertheless, do not prevent certain Powers favourably disposed to South Africa from attaching some credibility to them.

155. In fact, the latest attacks by the racist troops of Pretoria stem less from a desire to neutralize SWAPO than from the direct support for subversive groups remote-controlled by South Africa and which the Angolan troops are defeating. By its acts of aggression against Angola and other countries of the region, by its policy of subversion that is of such unprecedented dimensions that it extends as far as Seychelles, South Africa has given proof that it is engaged in nothing less than war.

156. The policy of South Africa, just like that of its natural ally in the Middle East, is a constant challenge to the international community, and first and foremost to the United Nations, whose very foundations it undermines and whose authority it flouts.

157. Let it be recalled in this regard that the debates and decisions of the Council have clearly assessed re-

sponsibility, have noted the constant aggression and identified the aggressor. Since 1976, practically year after year, the Council has condemned South African acts of aggression against Angola, called for its immediate cessation, demanded the immediate withdrawal of racist troops from Angolan territory, and reaffirmed the right of Angola to just and rapid compensation. The inability of this body to enforce its own decisions has done nothing but embolden Pretoria in its intransigence, and the situation can only further deteriorate.

158. Hardly two weeks ago [*2508th meeting*], the Council adopted resolution 545 (1983) in which it condemned the military occupation of part of the territory of Angola by South Africa and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the troops of that régime. That resolution, as the events of today prove, was to suffer the same fate as that of its predecessors.

159. Statements by South Africa repeated here again yesterday, under an alleged offer to disengage, are meant only to hoodwink and confuse, as several delegations have stated. In that connection, the representative of Angola drew the attention of the Council to Pretoria's manoeuvres when he declared on 16 December:

> "In a gesture of calculated cynicism, the racist régime, upon hearing of my Government's request that a Council meeting be convened, made a tactical move aimed at diffusing expressions of support for the Angolan position and the Angolan cause, and at giving its allies the dubious distinction of being able to point with pride to the fact that, at last, their policy of constructive engagement is paying off.
>
> "It is such racist tactics and strategies that we in southern Africa have learned, through bitter experience with Pretoria and through trust in its allies, to be extremely wary of." [*2504th meeting, paras. 19 and 20.*]

160. Today, only one simple question arises: has resolution 545 (1983) been implemented? To that question we must all reply with an unequivocal "No".

161. This reply stems from the continued military occupation of part of southern Angola and from the savage acts of aggression against several Angolan provinces. It stems from the arrogant statements by the leaders of Pretoria, which have been echoed in the Council chamber; this organ is thus constantly obliged to acknowledge an open rebellion against its authority. The situation prevailing in southern Angola illustrates the seriousness of the new challenge to the Council. This organ has failed to draw the appropriate conclusions from the obstinacy of the Pretoria régime, which continues to defy the United Nations; the Council has not brought all its weight to bear in enforcing its decisions. Hence its reactions could not have a deterrent effect. Its carefully measured injunctions and verbal condemnations, never coupled with effective measures, could never prevent Pretoria from pursuing its policy of oppression and aggression; quite the contrary.

162. The present situation is critical. What is the use of this debate if it should conclude and this arrant military occupation and armed aggression as well as the outright defiance of the Council do not incur the sanctions they deserve? Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations is designed to impose respect for legality. The Security Council must invoke it. The Council must also condemn the military occupation of southern Angola and the acts of armed aggression by the Pretoria régime against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. It must demand the cessation of aggression, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist troops from the territory of Angola and compensation for damage done to that country. Only the adoption of such measures can restore the Council's credibility and reinforce its role as the guarantor of international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

NOTE

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/37/1), p. 3.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61313—January 1993—2,050